

REMARKS

Claims 2-9 and 13-15 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 10-12 have been canceled. Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 13 and 14 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Asanuma, et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 of the present invention has been amended to include limitations similar to original Claim 1 plus the limitation “a piston that is actuated by the expansion pressure of the vaporized portion of the fluid”. Claim 3 has been amended to include the limitations of amended Claim 2.

Figure 2 of Asanuma discloses a vessel 3, an oil chamber 6, a pressurizing chamber 7, a heating device 8 and an additional heating device 12. The system in Asanuma uses engine waste heat to heat the fluid in vessel 3 and this engine waste is provided to vessel 3 using the engines cooling water flowing through heater 8. The only cooler illustrated in Asanuma is fins 3A illustrated in Figure 1 and fins 3A are not disposed below the heater 8 in Figure 1 or the additional heater 12 shown in Figure 2.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 2 and 3, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Claim 1 has been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wheatley, et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Wheatley discloses a cylinder that preferably contains a gas. The specification of Wheatley in column 16, lines 3-8 appears to disclose that the cylinder may also contain a liquid. However, there is nothing disclosed regarding the vaporization of the liquid or that the cooler is for cooling a vaporized portion of the fluid that was vaporized by the heater as is defined in amended Claims 2 and 3. In addition, Wheatley discloses a diaphragm which is allowed to move because of a flexible annulus 54. Claims 2 and 3 now define a piston that is actuated by the expansion pressure of the vaporized portion of the fluid.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 2 and 3, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 8 and 13, which ultimately depend from Claim 2 or Claim 3, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Claim 1 has been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJOINDER

Applicant respectfully requests the rejoinder of withdrawn Claims 6, 7, 9 and 14.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 22, 2004

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg